



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

(2)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/127,571

07/31/98

VARGHESE

F

COMP: 0016

PM92/0914

FLETCHER YODER & EDWARDS

P O BOX 692289

HOUSTON TX 77269-2289

EXAMINER

TRAN, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3634

DATE MAILED:

09/14/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/127,571

Applicant(s)  
VARGHESE ET AL.

Examiner  
KHOA TRAN

Group Art Unit  
3634



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 31, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☒ The drawing(s) filed on Jul 31, 1998 is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3634

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

The drawings are objected to because of the following: With respect to Figure 2, it appears that reference numeral "20" is improperly identified a front opening; reference numeral "36" is incorrectly identified the structure it intends (Note in Figure 3, reference numeral "36" is identified the recess of the server and not the recess of the rail, see page 9, line 10). With respect to Figures 2 and 3, it appears that reference numerals "42" and "56", and "44" and "54" have been used to designate the same rail structure. (It should be noted that the support rails are being referenced by numerals "56" and "54", see page 8, lines 15-18). It is suggested that in Figures 2 and 9, reference numerals "42" and "44" should be changed to --56-- and --54--. Relatively with Figure 4, it appears that reference numerals "104" and "102" have been used to designate the same rail structure. With respect to Figure 7, the front securement bracket referencing "166" fails to show in the drawing as described in the specification on page 14, line 4. With respect to Figure 9, the lead line of reference numerals "70" and "72" should be a dash lead line because the structures thereof are hidden in the figure. Further, it appears that on top left hand corner of Figure 9, reference numeral "112" is not properly identified to the respective part to which it refers. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 3634

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, "a height envelop" in claim 19 and the "separable mounting bracket" in claim 20 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Applicants are required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

### *Specification*

The Specification is objected to because the consistent terminology with respect to reference numeral "98" is not maintained. For example, on page 11, lines 13-14, reference numeral "98" is being referred to "an inner slide rail" then on line 18, it being referred to "a securing rail". Note if this element is meant to be the same, then the terminology must be consistent. Correction is required.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: All recitation of "individual servers" should be changed to --individual server-- in order to be grammatically correct. On page 9, line 13, "50" should be changed to --52-- in order to agree with what has been described. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 3634

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 3-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by H. S. Fall.

The claims are of such breadth that they read on the rack mounting system of H. S. Fall. H. S. Fall discloses a rack mounting system comprising two opposite slide mechanisms having the support rails (10) supporting the slide rails (12, 14). The support rail has a well define first and second securement regions that constitute a central web (54, 56) with first and second flanges (64, 70) extend over between the web. The slide rail (12 and 14) has a height approximately less than half the distance of the support rail. Each slide rail is telescopingly mated with another rails (18, 20) in a stack transverse direction such that to form a set of the slide rail assembly. The slide rail assemblies are disposed adjacently to the longitudinal edges (64, 66, 68, 70) of the securement regions. See Figures 1-5.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

Art Unit: 3634

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-10, 12, 13, and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings et al. in view of J. R. Jones et al. Hastings et al. disclose a rack mount computer system (10) comprising a rectangle configured cabinet (12) enclosed by access sides and rear panels (16, 20) and an access door (22) is hingedly secured to the front side of the cabinet. The cabinet is designed to have supporting rail structures (52) that is attached to the side panels for supporting the slidingly computer component server (32a) extend in and out the cabinet for access. The server has a telescoping slide rail portions at the lower end of its peripheral side walls (48) for cooperatively engaged the sliding rail assemblies (54, 56) and the supporting rail structures (52). A mounting cable support bracket (122) with hinges and flanges connected between the rear sever and the rear post (28) of the cabinet wherein the bracket is extending out and retract as the server slide in and out the cabinet. See Figures 1-4. J. R. Jones et al. teach the two identical opposite rail systems comprising a support rail (A) supporting slide rail © that is telescopingly mated in a stack transverse direction with other rail (B) in order to form a set of a rail assembly. The support rail has a central web with an upper and lower flanges (10, 11) formed thereof at the top and bottom, see Figure 11. The web has a longitudinal axis that is dividing the web into the upper and lower mounting regions. (It should be noted that all objects have a longitudinal axis). There are attaching means (20) located at the upper and lower securement regions of the web. The slide rail © is specifically recited as having a less vertical depth than the

Art Unit: 3634

supporting rail so that it fixed at the lower edge portion of the support rail, see column 2, lines 21-23. See Figures 1-13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to provide the rack mount computer system of Hastings et al. with a rail system as taught by J. R. Jones et al. in order to have a slide rail that is telescopingly mated in a stack transverse direction with other rail to form a slide assembly. With respect to the slide rail assembly having a height less than half the distance of the support rail, it would have been an obvious matter of choice of design at the time the invention to have made the slide rail assembly half the height of the support rail for a particular application thus producing no new and unexpected results. Also, it should be noted that J. R. Jones is specifically teaches the slide rail assembly is less depth/height than the supporting rail. With respect to the peripheral side walls of the server having a recess, it would have been an obvious matter of choice of design at the time the invention to have provided such recess to peripheral side walls of the server in order to have a slide rail portion mounted thereon to be flushed with the side wall of the server.

Claims 2, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hastings et in view of J. R. Jones et al. as applied to claims 1, 3-10, 12, 13, and 15-21 above, and further in view of Kofstad. Kofstad teaches the support rail (54) has plurality apertures on the upper and lower mounting regions for receiving fasteners, see Figure 4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to have provided the support rails of Hastings et al. with plurality apertures as taught by Kofstad in order for support

Art Unit: 3634

rails to be enabled to receive plurality fasteners to further enhance the securement of the rail to the structure that is being mounted to.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure. A. H. Anderson, C. A. Bissman, F. W. Hansen et al., Vogt, Cherry, Hendrich et al., Jordan, R. L. Myers, D. E. Hunter, Litchfield et al, Hagen et al., and Parvin are cited to show similar configurations of design.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khoa Tran whose telephone number is (703) 306-3437. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3598 or 305-3597.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168.



Daniel P. Stodola  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3600

Khoa Tran

September 06, 1999